# The DEAN of St. *PAUL's*

# APOLOGY

FOR

Writing againſt SOCINIANS, *&c.*

Imprimatur,

Jan. 17. 169$\frac{2}{3}$.

Geo. Royse, *R. R^mo. in Christo Patri ac Dom. Dom.* Johan. *Archiep. Cant. à Sacris Domest.*

7

# AN APOLOGY FOR Writing against *SOCINIANS*, IN DEFENCE OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE *Holy Trinity and Incarnation*

F. 2. 61

BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

In ANSWER to a Late *Earneſt and Compaſſionate Suit for Forbearance to the Learned Writers of ſome Controverſies at preſent.*

By WILLIAM SHERLOCK, D. D. Dean of St. *Paul's*, Maſter of the *Temple*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Their MAJESTIES.

*LONDON:*
Printed for Will. Rogers, at the Sun over-againſt St. *Dunſtan's* Church in *Fleetſtreet*. 1693.

719:02

# AN APOLOGY FOR Writing againſt SOCINIANS, &c.

AFTER a long ſilence, and patient expectation what *the Learned Writers of ſome Controverſies at preſent* (as a late Author calls them) would bring forth, I intend by the *Aſſiſtance of the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnate Jeſus*, whoſe Bleſſing I moſt earneſtly Implore, to reſume the *Defence of the Catholick Faith*; which I ſhall Publiſh in ſome few ſhort Treatiſes, as I can find Leiſure for it, that I may not diſcourage my Readers by too Voluminous a Work.

But before I venture to Diſpute theſe matters any farther, it is neceſſary to make ſome Apology for Diſputing; which is thought very Unchriſtian and Uncharitable, and of dangerous Conſequence, eſpecially when we undertake the Defence of the Fundamentals of our Faith, againſt the rude and inſolent Aſſaults of Hereticks.

Sometime ſince, *A Melancholy Stander-by* would be a *Stander-by* no longer, but interpoſed *An Earneſt and Compaſſionate Suit for Forbearance, to the Learned Writers of ſome Controverſies at preſent.* Theſe *Learned Writers of Controverſy*, are the *Socinians*, who ridiculed without any Learning or Common Senſe, *the* Athanaſian *Creed, and the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation:* The *Forbearance* he deſires, is, That no body ſhould write againſt them; though Dr. *Wallis* and my ſelf are more immediately concerned in this *Suit.*

Who this *Melancholy Stander-by* is, I ſhall not enquire, for my Controverſy is not with Men, but with Doctrines; and I know by experience, that common fame is not always to be truſted, much leſs ſuſpicions; but if he be a Divine of the Church of *England*, it ſeems very ſtrange, that he ſhould profeſs himſelf a *Stander-by*, when the Fundamentals of the Chriſtian Faith are in queſtion; and a *Melancholy* Stander-by to ſee ſome others undertake the Defence of it. I confeſs I am always very jealous of men, who are ſo very Tender on the wrong ſide; for obſerve it when you will, their Tenderneſs is always owing to their Inclination. But to defend our ſelves, let us briefly conſider what he ſays.

Earneſt Suit, p. 1. He thinks, *The open Diſſentions of its Profeſſors a great blemiſh to the Reformation:* That is, that it is a great blemiſh for any men openly to defend the true Faith, which others openly oppoſe, or ſecretly undermine; but certainly it would be a greater blemiſh to the *Reformation*, to have *Old Hereſies* revived, and the true *Ancient Catholick Faith* ſcorned, and no body appear in the Defence of it. But we know his mind, That it is for the honour of the *Reformation* not

not to Diſpute, though it be for the moſt Important Truths. Surely our *Reformers* were not ſo much againſt *Diſputing*.

But if theſe Diſſentions be ſo great a blemiſh to the *Reformation*, whoſe Fault is it? Theirs who diſſent from the Truth, or theirs who defend it? This is a very plain caſe; for no body would oppoſe the Truth, if no body taught it: *The urging too ſtrict an Union* in matters of Faith, *begets diſſentions*: That is, to require an open and undiſguiſed Profeſſion of our Baptiſmal Faith in *Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*, as the Terms of Chriſtian Communion, is the Criminal Cauſe of our Diſſentions. Well: What ſhall we do then? Renounce the Faith of the Trinity, for the ſake of Peace? This he dares not ſay, for that would pull off his diſguiſe; but *Chriſtianity muſt be left in that Latitude and Simplicity wherein it was deli-* P. 2. *vered by our Lord and his Apoſtles*. This had been a good Propoſal, would he have told us what this *Latitude* and *Simplicity* is; for I am for no other Faith than what Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught: But I would gladly know what he means by the *Latitude* of Faith: For if the Chriſtian Faith be ſuch a broad Faith, muſt we not believe the whole breadth of it? Or has Chriſt and his Apoſtles left it at liberty to believe what we like, and to let the reſt alone? To believe that *Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are One Supreme Eternal God*; or to believe that the *Father alone is the True God, the Son a mere Man, and the Holy Ghoſt nothing but a Divine Inſpiration*? To believe that the *Eternal Word* was *made Fleſh*; or that Chriſt was no more than a Man, who had no being before he was born of the Virgin *Mary*? He can mean nothing elſe by this *Latitude* of Faith, but that Chriſt

and his Apoſtles have left theſe matters ſo ambiguous and undetermined, that we may believe what we pleaſe; and then indeed thoſe do very ill, who diſpute theſe matters: But this is ſuch a breadth as has no depth; for ſuch a Faith as this can have no foundation. Can we certainly learn from Scripture, Whether Chriſt be a *God Incarnate*, or a *mere Man*? If we cannot, Why ſhould we believe either? If we can, then one is true, and the other falſe; and then there is no *Latitude* in Faith, unleſs Chriſt and his Apoſtles have left it indifferent, whether we believe what is true, or what is falſe; what they have taught us, or what we like better our ſelves.

In the ſame manner he leaves us to gueſs what he means by the *Simplicity* of the Faith. He is very angry with the *School-Doctors, as worſe enemies to Chriſtianity, than either Heathen Philoſophers, or perſecuting Emperors.* Pray what hurt have they done? I ſuppoſe he means the Corruption of Chriſtianity with thoſe barbarous Terms of *Perſon, Nature, Eſſence, Subſiſtence, Conſubſtantiality*, &c. which will not ſuffer *Hereticks* to lye concealed under Scripture-Phraſes: But why muſt the *Schoolmen* bear all the blame of this? Why does he not accuſe the *Ancient Fathers and Councils*, from whom the *Schoolmen* learnt theſe Terms? Why does he let St. *Auſtin* eſcape, from whom the *Maſter of the Sentences* borrowed moſt of his Diſtinctions and Subtilties? But ſuppoſe theſe *Unlucky Wits* had uſed ſome new Terms, have they taught any new Faith about the *Trinity in Unity*, which the *Catholick Church* did not teach? And if they have only guarded the Chriſtian Faith with a hedge of Thorns, which diſguiſed Hereticks cannot break through, Is this *to wound Chriſtianity in its very Vitals?*

P. 2.

*tals?* No, no: They will only prick the fingers of Hereticks, and ſecure Chriſtianity from being wounded; and this is one great Cauſe why ſome men are ſo angry with the *School-Doctors*; tho the more general Cauſe is, becauſe they have not Induſtry enough to read or underſtand them.

He ſays, *The firſt Reformers complained of this, and deſired a purer and more ſpiritual ſort of Divinity.* What? With reſpect to the Doctrine of the *Trinity and Incarnation*? What *purer Reformers* were theſe? I'm ſure not our *Engliſh* Reformers, whom he cenſures for *retaining Scholaſtick cramping Terms in their Publick Prayers*: He means the beginning of our Litany: *O God the Father of Heaven: O God the Son, Redeemer of the World: O God the Holy Ghoſt, proceeding from the Father and the Son: O Holy, Bleſſed, and Glorious Trinity, Three Perſons and One God:* Theſe are his *Scholaſtick, Cramping Terms*, which he would fling out of our Liturgy, when the ſeaſon of ſuch bleſſed *Alterations* comes. I hope thoſe Excellent Perſons among us, who, I doubt not, for better Reaſons did not long ſince think of ſome Alterations, will conſider what a foul Imputation this is upon ſuch a Deſign, when ſuch a perſon ſhall publickly declare, That they ought to Alter and Reform the Doctrine of the Trinity out of our Prayers.

But the whole Myſtery of this *Latitude and Simplicity* of Faith which he pleads for, is that plauſible Project (which has been ſo much talked of of late) to confine our ſelves to *Scripture Terms and Phraſes*; to uſe none but *Scripture Words* in our Creeds and Prayers, without any Explication in what ſenſe thoſe words are to be underſtood: As he tells us, *Certainly we may Worſhip God right well, yea, moſt acceptably*, P. 3.

*ceptably, in words of his own Stamp and Coinage.* Now at the firſt Propoſal few men would ſuſpect, that there ſhould be any hurt in this; though it would make one ſuſpect ſome ſecret in it, to conſider that Hereticks were the firſt Propoſers of it, and that Orthodox Chriſtians rejected it. The *Arians* objected this againſt the *Homoouſion*, or *the Son's being of the ſame Subſtance with the Father*, that it was an Unſcriptural Word; but the *Nicene Fathers* did not think this a good reaſon to lay it aſide: For what reaſon can there be to reject any words, which we can prove to expreſs the true ſenſe of Scripture, though they are not found there? For muſt we believe the Words or the Senſe of Scripture? And what reaſon then can any man have to reject the Words, though they be no Scripture-Words, if he believes the Senſe contained in them to be the ſenſe of Scripture? The *Homoiouſion*, or *that the Son had a Nature like the Father's, tho not the ſame*, was no more a Scripture-Word, than the *Homoouſion*; and yet the *Arians* did not diſlike that, becauſe it was no Scripture-Word; nor are the *Socinians* angry at any man who ſays, That Chriſt is but *a meer man, who had no Being before he was born of the Virgin* Mary; tho theſe words are no where in Scripture: And is it not ſtrange, that a man who heartily believes, or at leaſt pretends to believe, that *Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are One Eternal God*, ſhould be angry with a *Trinity in Unity*, or *Three Perſons and one God*, which do as aptly expreſs the Faith which he profeſſes, as any Words he can think of?

It is very odd to be zealous for Scripture-Words without the Scripture Senſe. If the Scripture have any determined Senſe, then that which is the true Senſe

Senſe of Scripture, is the true Faith; and if we muſt *contend earneſtly for the true Faith*, we muſt contend for the true Senſe of Scripture, and not merely for its Words; and when Hereticks have uſed their utmoſt art to make the Words of Scripture ſignifie what they pleaſe, is it not neceſſary to fix their true Senſe, and to expreſs that Senſe in ſuch other Words as Hereticks cannot pervert?

There are but few words in common ſpeech, but what are ſometimes differently uſed, in a *Proper* or *Metaphorical*, a *Large* or a *Limited* Senſe; and all wiſe and honeſt men eaſily underſtand from the circumſtances of the place, in what ſenſe they are uſed; but if men be perverſe, they may expound words *properly* when they are uſed *metaphorically*, or *metaphorically* when they are uſed *properly*; and there is no confuting them from the bare ſignification of the word, becauſe it may be, and oftentimes is uſed both ways; and therefore in ſuch caſes we muſt conſider the Circumſtances of the Text, and compare it with Parallel Texts, to find out in what ſenſe the word is there uſed; and when we have found it, it is reaſonable and neceſſary to expreſs the true Chriſtian Faith, not merely in Scripture words, which are abuſed and perverted by Hereticks, but in ſuch other words, if we can find any ſuch, as expreſs the true ſenſe in which the Scripture-words are uſed, and in which all Chriſtians muſt underſtand them, who will retain the Purity of the Chriſtian Faith. We do not hereby alter the Chriſtian Faith, nor require them to believe any thing more than what the Scripture teaches, tho we require them to profeſs their Faith in other words, which are not indeed in Scripture, but expreſs the true and deter-

determined ſenſe of Scripture words. And this is all the *Latitude of Faith* which this *Stander-by* ſo tragically complains we have deſtroyed, *viz.* That we have brought the Scripture words to a fixt and determined ſenſe, that Hereticks can no longer conceal themſelves in a *Latitude* of expreſſion, nor ſpread their Hereſies in Scripture words, with a Traditionary Senſe and Comment of their own.

I would ask any man who talks at this rate about a *Latitude of Faith*, Whether there be any more than One True Chriſtian Faith? And whether Chriſt and his Apoſtles intended to teach any more? Or whether they did not intend, That all Chriſtians ſhould be obliged to believe this One Faith? If this be granted, there can be no more Latitude in the Faith, than there is in a Unit; and if they taught but One Faith, they muſt intend that their words ſhould ſignifie but that one Faith; and then there can be no *Intentional Latitude* in their words neither; and what Crime then is the Church guilty of, if ſhe teach the true Chriſtian Faith, that ſhe teaches it in ſuch words as have no Latitude, no Ambiguity of Senſe, which Hereticks may deny if they pleaſe, but which they can't corrupt in favour of their Hereſies, as they do Scripture words?

It is an amazing thing to me, that any man who has any Zeal, any Concernment for the true Chriſtian Faith, who does not think it perfectly indifferent what we believe, or whether we believe any thing or not, ſhould judge it for the advantage of Chriſtianity, and a proper Expedient for the Peace of the Church, for all men to agree in the ſame Scripture words, and underſtand them in what ſenſe they pleaſe; tho one believes Chriſt to be the

Eternal

Eternal Son of God, and another to be but a mere man; which it ſeems has no great hurt in it, if they do but agree in the ſame words: But if the Faith be ſo indifferent, I cannot imagine why we ſhould quarrel about Words; the fairer and honeſter Propoſal is, That every man ſhould believe as he pleaſes, and no man concern himſelf to confute Hereſies, or to divide the Church with Diſputes; which is the true Latitude our Author ſeems to aim at; and then he may believe as he pleaſes too.

But pray, why ſhould we not write againſt the *Socinians*? Eſpecially when they are the Aggreſſors, and without any provocation publiſh and diſperſe the moſt impudent and ſcandalous Libels againſt the Chriſtian Faith. He will give us ſome very wiſe Reaſons for this by and by, when he comes to be *plain* and *ſuccinct*; in the mean time we muſt take ſuch as we can meet with.

He is afraid people ſhould loſe all Reverence for the *Litany*, ſhould we go on to vindicate the Do- P. 3.
ctrine of the *Trinity in Unity*: I ſhould not eaſily have apprehended this, and poſſibly ſome of the *common people* might have been as dull as my ſelf, had he not taken care before he parted, for fear no body elſe ſhould obſerve it, to teach people to ridicule the Trinity in their Prayers. Dr. *Wallis* would not undertake to ſay what a Divine *Perſon* ſignifies, as diſtinguiſhed from *Nature and Eſſence*, only ſays, a *Perſon* is *ſomewhat*, but the *True Notion* of a *Perſon* he does not know: This Author commends this as *ever held to by all Learned Trinitarians*; for indeed all the Doctor meant by his *ſomewhat* is, That Three *Perſons* ſignify Three *Real Subſiſtences*, and are *Real Things*, not a *Sabellian*

*Trinity of mere Names.* And yet in the very next Page he teaches his Readers to ridicule the Litany with the Doctors *ſomewhats: O Holy, Bleſſed, and Glorious Trinity, Three Somewhats, and One God,*
P. 16. *have Mercy on us, &c.* Was there ever any thing more Senſeleſs, or more Prophane! That becauſe the Doctor would not undertake to define a *Perſon*, but only aſſerted in general, That a Divine Perſon was *ſomewhat*, or ſome Real Being, in oppoſition to a mere Nominal Difference and Diſtinction; therefore in our Prayers we may as well call the Three Divine Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, *Three ſomewhats. Nobis non licet eſſe tam diſertis.* I am ſure he has reaſon heartily to pray, That theſe *Three ſomewhats*, as he prophanely calls them, *would have Mercy on him.*

P. 3. In the next place he ſays, *He is well aſſured, that the late* (Socinian) *Pamphlets would have died away, or have been now in few mens hands, had not divers perſons taken on them the labour to confute them.* But did his *Socinian* Friends, who were ſuch buſie Factors for the Cauſe, tell him ſo? Did they print them, that no body might read them? Were they not diſperſed in every Corner, and boaſted of in every Coffee-houſe, before any Anſwer appeared? However, were it ſo, is there no regard to be had to Hereticks themſelves? And is it not better that ſuch Pamphlets ſhould be in an hundred hands with an Anſwer, than in five hands without one? I ſhould think it at any time a good reward for all the labour of confuting, to reſcue or preſerve a very few from ſuch fatal Errors; which I doubt not but

but is a very acceptable ſervice to that *Merciful Shepherd*, who was ſo careful to ſeek one loſt and ſtraggling Sheep. Hereſies and Vices dye by being neglected, juſt as Weeds do; for we know the Parable, That *the Devil ſows his tares, while men ſleep.* But this is no new Charge; the good Biſhop of *Alexandria* met with the ſame Cenſures for his Zeal againſt *Arius*; for it ſeems that Hereſie would have died too, if it had not been oppoſed. I doubt this Author judges of other mens Zeal for Hereſy, by his own Zeal for the Truth, which wants a little rubbing and chafing to bring it to life; but Hereſy is all flame and ſpirit, will blow and kindle it ſelf, if it be not quenched.

But yet if what he ſays be true, That by our unskilful way of confuting Hereſie, we *run into thoſe very Abſurdities which our Adverſaries would reduce us to*; This I confeſs is a very great fault, and when he ſhews me any of thoſe Abſurdities, I will thankfully correct them; for all the Obloquies in the world will never make me bluſh to recant an Error: But before he pretends to that, I muſt deſire him, that he would firſt read my Book, which I know ſome men cenſure without reading it. Such general Accuſations are very ſpiteful, and commonly have a mixture of ſpite both againſt the Cauſe, and againſt the Perſon.

His next Argument is very obſervable: We muſt not diſpute now againſt *Socinians*, becauſe *theſe Controverſies* about the Trinity *have been* P. 4. *above Thirteen hundred years ago determined by two general Councils* (*the* Nicene, *and firſt* Conſtantinopolitan), which are owned by our Church,

and their Creeds received into our Liturgy. *Ergo*, we must not defend this Faith against Hereticks, because it is the Faith of two General Councils which are owned by our Church. Did *Athanasius* think this a good Argument against Writing and Disputing against the *Arians*, after the *Council of Nice* had condemned *Arius* and his Doctrines? Did St. *Basil*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Nyssen*, St. *Chrysostom*, St. *Jerom*, St. *Austin*, think this a good Argument, who wrote so largely against these Heresies, which former Councils had condemned? But this Author thinks the best way is to *let the Matter stand upon this bottom of Authority*; that is, let Hereticks ridicule our Faith as much as they please, we must make them no other answer, but that this is the Faith of the *Nicene* and *Constantinopolitan* Councils, and the Faith of the *Church of England*. And can he intend this for any more than a Jest, when he knows how *Socinians* despise the determinations of Councils, and particularly with what scorn they treat the *Nicene Fathers*? Is this an Age to resolve our Faith into *Church Authority*? Or would he himself believe such absurd Doctrines as they represent the *Trinity in Unity* to be, merely upon *Church Authority*? For my part I declare I would not. I greatly value the Authority of those Ancient Councils, as credible Witnesses of the *Traditionary* Sense of the Church before those Controversies were started; but were not these Doctrines taught in Scripture, were they manifestly repugnant to the plain and evident Principles of Reason, all the Councils in the World should never reconcile me to them, no more than they should

ſhould to the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantion*. And therefore methinks he might have at leaſt allowed us to have challenged the Scriptures as well as General Councils on our ſide; and to have vindicated our Faith from all pretended abſurdities and contradictions to Reaſon. But would any man of common ſenſe, who had not intended to expoſe the Faith of the Holy Trinity, have told the world at this time of day, That we have no other ſafe and ſure bottom for our Faith, but only the Authority of General Councils? Nay, That the Council of *Nice* it ſelf, on whoſe Authority we muſt reſt, had little elſe themſelves for their Determinations but only Authority, That *it was Authority chiefly carried the Point*. And thus for fear we ſhould have believed too much upon the Authority of Councils, which is the only bottom he will allow our Faith, he gives them a ſecret ſtab himſelf, and makes their Authority ridiculous. That the ſeveral Biſhops declared, what Faith had been taught and received in their Churches is true; That this Authority *chiefly* carried the Point, is falſe: *Athanaſius* grew famous in the Council for his learned and ſubtile Diſputations, which confounded the *Arians*; and what Arguments he chiefly relied on, we may ſee in his Works: And whoever does but look into the *Fathers*, who wrote againſt the *Arians* in thoſe days, will find, that their Faith was reſolved into Scripture and Reaſon, and not meerly or *chiefly* into Authority.

And thus he comes to be *Plain* and *Succinct*, and tells us, That *of all Controverſies we can touch upon at preſent, this of the Trinity is the moſt unreaſonable, the moſt dangerous, and ſo the moſt unſeaſonable.* P. 52.

It

It is the moſt *Unreaſonable*: 1. *Becauſe it is on all hands confeſs'd, the Deity is Infinite, Unſearchable, Incomprehenſible; and yet every one who pretends to Write plainer than another on this controverſy, profeſſes to make all Comprehenſible and eaſy.*

I perceive he is well verſed in Mr. *Hobbs*'s Divinity; though I can diſcover no marks of his skill in Fathers and Councils. For this was Mr. *Hobb*'s reaſon, why we ſhould not pretend to know any thing of God, nor inquire after his Attributes, becauſe he has but one Attribute, which is, that he is *Incomprehenſible*; and as this Author argues, *It is a ſmall favour to requeſt of Perſons of Learning, that they ſhould be conſiſtent with, and not contradict themſelves*: that is, That they would not pretend to know any thing of God, whom they acknowledge to be *Incomprehenſible*, which is to pretend to know, what they confeſs cannot be known. Now I deſire to know, Whether we may Diſpute about the Being and Nature of God, and his eſſential Attributes and Perfections; and vindicate the Notion of a Deity from thoſe *Impoſſibilities*, *Inconſiſtencies*, *Abſurdities*, which ſome *Atheiſtical Philoſophers* charge on it, notwithſtanding that we confeſs God to be *Incomprehenſible*? And if the Incomprehenſibility of the Divine Nature does not ſignifie, that we can know nothing of God, and muſt inquire nothing about him; the Trinity of Divine Perſons is as proper an object of our Faith, and modeſt Inquiries, as the Unity of the Divine Eſſence, for they are both Incomprehenſible. And to ſay, That *every one who pretends to write plainer than another*

*on*

*on this Controverſy, profeſſes to make all comprehenſible and eaſy*, may with equal Truth and Authority be charg'd on all thoſe who undertake to vindicate the Notion and Idea of a God, or to explain any of the Divine Attributes and Perfections. A finite mind cannot comprehend what is infinite; but yet one man may have a truer and more perfect Notion of the Nature and Attributes of God than another: God is Incomprehenſible in Heaven as well as on Earth, and yet Angels and Glorified Spirits know God after another manner than we do. There muſt be infinite degrees of knowledge, when the object is infinite; and every new degree is more perfect than that below it; and yet no Creature can attain the higheſt degree of all, which is a perfect comprehenſion: So that the knowledge of God may increaſe every day, and men may Write plainer about theſe matters every day, without pretending to make all that is in God, even a Trinity in Unity, *comprehenſible and eaſy*.

This is a ſpiteful and ſcandalous imputation, and is intended to repreſent all thoſe who undertake to write about the Trinity, and to vindicate the Primitive Faith of the Church from the ſcorn and contempt of Hereticks, as a company of vain-conceited, preſuming, but ignorant Scriblers; who pretend to make the *Incomprehenſible* Nature of God, *comprehenſible and eaſy*. But the comfort is, we have ſo good Company, that we are able to bear this Charge without bluſhing; even General Councils, and thoſe great Lights of the Church, *Athanaſius*, St. *Hillary*, St. *Baſil*, the *Gregories*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, St. *Auſtin*, and many others, beſides all thoſe who in all

all ſucceeding Ages to this day, have with equal Zeal and Learning defended the ſame Cauſe; and yet never profeſs'd to make *all comprehenſible and eaſy*. All that any man pretends to in vindicating the Doctrine of the Trinity, is to prove that this Faith is taught in Scripture, and that it contains no ſuch Abſurdities and Contradictions, as ſhould force a Wiſe man to reject it, and either to reject the Scriptures for its ſake, or to put ſome ſtrained and unnatural ſenſes on Scripture to reconcile it to the Principles of Reaſon; and this, I hope, may be done by thoſe, who yet acknowledge the Divine Nature, and the Trinity in Unity to be Incomprehenſible.

But here he had a very fair opportunity, had he thought fit to take it, to correct the Inſolence and Preſumption of his *Learned Writers of Controverſy*; who will not allow the Divine Nature to be *Incomprehenſible*, and will not believe God himſelf concerning his own Nature, beyond what their Reaſon can conceive and comprehend: Who deny *Preſcience* for the ſame Reaſon, that they deny the *Trinity*, becauſe they can't conceive it, nor reconcile it with the liberty of Human Actions; and for the ſame reaſon may deny all the Attributes of God, which have ſomething in them beyond what we can conceive; eſpecially an Eternity without beginning, and without Succeſſion, which is chargeable with more Abſurdities and Contradictions, than the Trinity it ſelf: For a duration, which can't be meaſured; and an eternal duration, which can be meaſured; and a Succeſſion without a beginning,

a Beginning, a Second or Third without a First, are unconceivable to us, and look like very plain and irreconcilable Contradictions. This is the true use of the *Incomprehensibility* of the Divine Nature; not to stop all Enquiries after God, nor to discourage our Studies of the Divine Nature and Perfections: for we may know a great deal, and may every day increase our knowledge of what is Incomprehensible, thô we cannot know it all; but to check the presumption of some vain Pretenders to Reason, who will not own a God, nor believe any thing of God, which their Reason cannot comprehend; which must not only make them Hereticks, but, if pursued to its just Consequences, must make them Atheists, or make such a God, as no body will own, or worship, but themselves, a God *adequate and commensurate to their Understandings*, which must be *a little, finite, comprehensible God.*

In the next place, to prove how unreasonable it is to Dispute in Vindication of the Trinity, he observes again, That *this Matter has been sufficiently determined by due Authority:* but having answered this once, I see no need to answer it again.

To back this he adds, That *the present issue shews, that in this World it never will be better understood:* for it seems, as he says, *The Master of the Sentences*, and some Modern Writers, have made very sad work of it. And yet he does not seem to be very intimately acquainted with *the Master of the Sentences*, nor some of these Modern Writers. But all that he means is, that no body can say any thing to the purpose for so absurd a Doctrine, as *a Trinity in Unity*; and therefore he plainly adds, *The more Men draw the disputacious Saw, the more perplexed and intricate the Question is*; and therefore the only secure way is, to leave off disputing

for the Trinity, and let *Socinians* Diſpute againſt it by themſelves. But ſuch Stuff as this, deſerves another ſort of Anſwer than I can give it.

Page 7. But he concludes this Argument of *Unreaſonableneſs* very remarkably. *And Laſtly, Hereby our Church at preſent, and the Common Chriſtianity (it may be feared) will be more and more daily expoſed to Atheiſtical Men; for this being but the reſult of the former particulars, and ſuch kind of Men daily growing upon us, it cannot be believed, they can over-look the advantages which is ſo often given them.* The ſum of which is, That to Vindicate the Doctrine of the Trinity againſt *Socinians*, will make Men Atheiſts. This is a very bold ſtroke for a Chriſtian, and a Divine, and I ſhall beg leave to expoſtulate this matter a little freely with him.

1*ſt*, I deſire to know, whether he thinks the Doctrine of the Trinity to be defenſible or not? If it be not defenſible, why does he believe it? Why ſhould we not rather openly and plainly reject the Doctrine of the Trinity, which would be a more effectual way to put a ſtop to Atheiſm, than to profeſs to believe it, but not to defend it? If it be defenſible, and there be no fault in the Doctrine, but that ſome Men have defended it ill, would it not much more have become him to have defended it better, than only to quarrel with thoſe who have defended it, as well as they could?

2*dly*, Why does he not tell the *Socinians*, what injury they do to common Chriſtianity, by ridiculing the Faith of the Holy Trinity, and expoſing it to the ſcorn of *Atheiſts*? Does he think that they are no Chriſtians, and ought not to be concerned for common Chriſtianity? Or does he think, that Atheiſts will like the Doctrine of the Trinity ever the better, for its being deſpiſed by *Socinians* as an abſurd contradictory Faith, with-

without having any Defence made by *Trinitarians*? Or does he think, that the Defences made by *Trinitarians* expose the Faith more than the Objections of *Socinians*? I wish I knew his mind, and then I could tell what to say to him.

3*dly*, How are *Atheists* concerned in the Disputes of the Trinity? Or how are we concerned to avoid scandalizing Atheists, who believe that there is no God at all? Must we be afraid of defending the Faith of the Trinity, lest Atheists should mock at it, who already mock at the Being of a God? What shall we have left of Christianity, if we must either cast away, or not defend every thing, which Atheists will mock at? Surely he has a very contemptible Opinion of the Doctrine of the Trinity, that he thinks all the Defences that are, or can be made for it, so ridiculous, that they are enough to make Men Atheists.

But I can tell him a Secret, which possibly he may be privy to, though in great modesty he conceals his knowledge, *viz.* That *Atheists* and *Deists*, Men who are for no Religion, or at least not for the Christian Religion, are of late very zealous *Socinians*; and they are certainly in the right of it: for run down the Doctrine of *the Trinity* and *Incarnation*, and there is an end of the Christian Religion, and with that an end of all Revealed Religion; and as for Natural Religion, they can make and believe as much, or as little of it as they please. And this is one Reason, and I am sure a better than any he has given against it, why we are, and ought to be so zealous at this time in opposing *Socinianism*, because it is the common Banner under which all the Enemies of Religion and Christianity unite. This makes that little contemptible Party think themselves considerable, that all the Atheists and Infidels, and li-

centious Wits of the Town, are their Converts; who promiſe themſelves a glorious Triumph over Chriſtianity, and particularly over the Church of *England*, by decrying and ſcorning the Catholick Faith of the Trinity and Incarnation.

II. Thus much for the *Unreaſonableneſs* of this Controverſie about the Holy Trinity; in the next place he tells us the *Danger* of it: and he has thought of ſuch an Argument to evince the danger of Diſputing for the Holy Trinity, as, I believe, was never dreamt of before; and that is, That it is *One of the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Religion; now to litigate touching a Fundamental, is to turn it into a Controverſie; that is, to unſettle, at leaſt endanger the unſettling the whole Superſtructure.* Now I am perfectly of his mind, that it is a dangerous thing to unſettle Foundations; But is it a dangerous thing too, to endeavour to preſerve and defend Foundations, when Hereticks unſettle them, and turn them into Diſpute and Controverſie? Let us put the *Being of God*, inſtead of *the Holy Trinity*, and ſee how he will like his Argument himſelf. The *Being of a God* is the Foundation of all Religion, and therefore it is dangerous to diſpute with Atheiſts about the Being of God, becauſe this is *to turn a Fundamental into a Controverſie, that is, to unſettle, or to endanger the unſetling the whole Superſtructure*: And thus we muſt not diſpute againſt Atheiſts, no more than againſt Socinians: And what is it then we muſt diſpute for? What elſe is worth diſputing? What elſe can we diſpute for, when Foundations are overturned? What is the meaning of that Apoſtolical Precept, *To contend earneſtly for the Faith*, *Jud.* 3. What Faith muſt we contend for, if not for Fundamentals? What Faith is that which can ſubſiſt without a Foundation?

Page 7.

But

But I would desire this Author to tell me, whether we must believe Fundamentals with, or without Reason? Whether we must take Fundamentals for granted, and receive them with an implicite Faith, or know for what Reason we believe them? If our Religion must not be built without a Foundation, like a Castle in the Air, it is certain, that the Fundamentals of our Faith ought to have a very sure Foundation, and therefore we are more concerned to understand and vindicate the Reasons of our Faith, with respect to Fundamentals, than to dispute any less Matters in Religion, for the Roof must tumble, if the Foundation fail.

What shall Christians do then, when *Atheists*, *Infidels*, and *Hereticks*, strike at the very Foundations of their Faith? Ought not they to satisfie themselves, that there is no force in the Objections, which are made against the Faith? Or must they confirm themselves with an obstinate Resolution, to believe on without troubling themselves about Objections, in defiance of all the power and evidence of Reason? This is not to believe like Men; Christianity had never prevailed against Paganism and Judaism upon these Terms; for they had Possession, Authority, and Prescription on their side, which is the only Reason and Security he gives us for the Faith of the Trinity, That *the Established Church is in possession of it.* Page 8.

If private Christians then must endeavour to satisfie themselves in the Reasons of their Faith, when Fundamentals are called in question, is it not the Duty of Christian Bishops and Pastors to defend the Faith, and to defend the Flock of Christ from those *grievous Wolves* St. *Paul* propheſied of? Is not this their proper Work and Business? And when the Faith is publickly oppos'd and scorned in Printed Libels, ought it not to

be

be as publickly defended? When Hereticks diſpute againſt the Faith, muſt we be afraid of diſputing for it, for fear of making *a Controverſie of Fundamentals*? Thanks be to God, our excellent *Primate* is above this fear, and has now in the Preſs a Defence of that Faith, which this Writer would perſwade all Men to betray by ſilence; and I hope ſo great an Example may at leaſt prevail with him, to let us diſpute on without any more *earneſt and compaſſionate Suits.*

Page 8. III. His laſt Argument is, The *Unſeaſonableneſs* of this Controverſie. He ſays, all Controverſies are now *unſeaſonable*; and I ſay a little more, that they are always ſo; for there is no Juncture *ſeaſonable* to broach Hereſies, and to oppoſe the Truth: but if Hereticks will diſpute againſt the Truth *unſeaſonably*; there is no time *unſeaſonable* to defend Fundamental Truths. But why is it ſo *unſeaſonable* in this *Juncture*? Becauſe *under God, nothing but an union of Councils, and joyning Hands and Hearts, can preſerve the Reformation, and ſcarce any thing more credit and juſtifie it, than an Union in Doctrinals.* To begin with the laſt firſt: Is *the Union in Doctrinals* ever the greater, that *Socinians* boldly and publickly affront the Faith of the Church, and no body appears to defend it? Will the World think that we are all of a mind, becauſe there is diſputing only on one ſide? Then they will think us all *Socinians*, as ſome *Forreigners* begin already to ſuſpect, which will be a very ſcandalous Union, and divide us from all other *Reformed Churches.* Let *Union* be never ſo deſirable, we cannot, we muſt not unite in Hereſie; thoſe break the Union, who depart from the Faith, not thoſe who defend it. When Hereſies are broached, the beſt way to preſerve the Unity of the Church, is to oppoſe and confute, and ſhame Hereſie and Hereticks, which

which will preserve the Body of Christians from being infected by Heresie, and the fewer there are, who forsake the Faith, the greater Unity there is in the Church.

But *nothing but Union of Counsels, and joyning Hands and Hearts, can preserve the Reformation.* Must we then turn all Socinians, to preserve the *Reformation*? Must we renounce Christianity, to keep out Popery? This Stander-by is misinformed, for *Socinianism* is no part of the *Reformation*; and so inconsiderable and abhorred *a Party*, when they stand by themselves, that all Parties who own any Religion, will joyn *Counsels, and Hands and Hearts* to renounce them.

But what he would insinuate is, that we shall never joyn against a common Enemy, whose Successes would endanger the *Reformation*, while there are any Religious Disputes among us. I hope he is mistaken, or else we shall certainly be conquered by *France*, for twenty such *compassionate Suits* as this, will never make us all of a mind; and whether we dispute or not, if we differ as much as if we did dispute, and are as zealous for the Interest of a Party, the case is the same. But he has unwarily confess'd a great Truth, which all Governments ought to consider, That every Schism in the Church, is a new Party and Faction in the State, which are always troublesome to Government when it wants their help.

But *these Disputes about the Trinity make sport for Papists.* It must be disputing against the Trinity then, not disputing for it; for they are very Orthodox in this point; and never admitted any Man to their Communion who disowned this Faith, or declared, that he thought it at any time *unreasonable*, *dangerous*, or *unseasonable* to dispute for it, when it was violently opposed.

I doubt this Proteſtant Church-man has made more ſport for Papiſts, than all our other Diſputes; for it is a new thing for ſuch Men to plead for *Socinians*, but no new thing to diſpute againſt them; and new Sports are always moſt entertaining.

But he has himſelf ſtarted an Objection, which if he could well anſwer, I could forgive him all the reſt. *But it will be ſaid, What ſhall we do? Shall we tamely by a baſe Silence give up the Point.*

This is the Objection, and he anſwers, *There is no danger of it, the Eſtabliſhed Church is in poſſeſſion of it, and diſpute will only increaſe the diſturbance.* But is there no danger that the Church may be flung out of poſſeſſion, and loſe the Faith, if ſhe don't defend it? No, *The Adverſaries to the received Doctrine* (Why not to the true Faith?) *cannot alter our Articles of Religion*; but if they can make Converts, and increaſe their Party, they may in time change our *Articles*, and then we ſhall hear no more of *compaſſionate Suits* for *forbearance. But they can diſpute everlaſtingly*; and let them diſpute on, we fear them not. But *they are Men ſubtil, ſober, induſtrious*; *many of them very vertuous, and* (as all muſt ſay) *ſetting aſide their Opinions, devout, pious, and charitable.* I perceive he is very intimately acquainted with them, though St. *Paul* commands all Chriſtians, To *mark thoſe which cauſe diviſions and offences contrary to the Doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them*, 16 Rom. 17. But let them be never ſo good Men, as ſome of the Heathen Philoſophers were, muſt we therefore tamely ſuffer them to pervert the Faith? But they are very *zealous*, and *the Preſſes are open*, and *they will never be ſilent.* They are zealous againſt the Truth, and therefore we muſt not be zealous for it; they will write and print, and ſpeak againſt the

the Truth, and will never be ſilent; and therefore we muſt be ſilent, and neither write, nor ſay any thing for the Truth. Was there ever ſuch a Reaſon thought of as this? Well! how long muſt we be ſilent? *Neglect them till a fit time and place:* But why is not this as fit a time, as ever we ſhall have, to prevent their ſowing Tares, or to pluck them up before they have taken too deep Root? Can there be a fitter time to oppoſe Hereſies, and to defend the true Chriſtian Faith, then when Hereticks are very bold and buſie in ſpreading their Hereſies, and oppoſing the Faith? But when this *fit time* is come (for I know not what he means by *a fit place*) what ſhall we do then? Will he then give us leave to write and diſpute againſt ſuch Hereticks? This he will not ſay; but *then let that be done, which ſhall be judged moſt Chriſtian and moſt Wholeſome.* But what is that? Will it ever be *moſt Chriſtian and moſt Wholeſome*, to diſpute for the Faith againſt Hereſie? If ever it will be ſo, why is it not ſo now? If this never will be *Chriſtian* and *Wholeſome*, what elſe is to be done to Hereticks *in fit time and place*, unleſs he intends to Phyſick 'em?

And it ſeems he has a Doſe ready prepared, *to lay all theſe Controverſies to an Eternal Sleep*; and it is, what he calls a *Negative Belief*, a pretty Contradiction, but never the leſs proper Cure for Hereſie. The Project is this, as far as I can underſtand him, That the *Socinians* ſhall not be required to own the Doctrines of the *Trinity and Incarnation*, but ſhall *ſo far agree, as not to contradict them, nor teach contrary to them:* Now I ſhould like this very well, that they would not oppoſe the received Doctrine of the Church, but I believe he knows ſome little clattering Tongues, Page 9.

which all the Opiates he has, can never lay asleep; and had he remembred what he had just before said concerning their *Zeal*, and their *Eternal disputing*, and that *they will never be silent*, he would never have proposed so impracticable a thing, as the imposing silence on them; which makes me suspect, that he intends something more than what he says, and therefore to prevent mistakes, I must ask him a Question or two.

1. Whether he will allow us, who, as he grants, are *in possession* of this Faith of the Trinity and Incarnation, to keep possession of it, and teach, explain, and confirm it to our People: we will answer none of their Books, if they won't write them; but if he expects that we should say nothing of, or for the Trinity, as he would have them say nothing against it, we must beg his Pardon; we do not think the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation to be of so little concernment, as to be parted with, or buried in silence. We believe Christian Religion to be built on this Faith, and therefore think ourselves as much bound to Preach it, as to Preach the Gospel; and if they will oppose the Faith, as long as we Preach it, we can have no Truce with them.

2*dly*, I hope he does not propose this *Negative Belief*, as he calls it, as *a Term of Communion*; that tho' we know they deny the Trinity and the Incarnation, yet if they will agree not publickly to oppose and contradict this Faith, we shall receive them to our Communion, and fling the Worship of the *Holy Trinity*, and of *a God Incarnate*, out of our *Liturgies* for their

ſake. I grant there may be ſuch things, as *Articles of Peace*, when Men joyn in the ſame Communion, notwithſtanding ſome leſs material Differences, while the Subſtantials of Faith and Worſhip are ſecure, and oblige themſelves not to diſturb the Peace of the Church with leſs Diſputes; but to make the Eſſentials of Faith and Worſhip *meer Articles of Peace*, to receive thoſe to our Communion, who deny the very Object of our Worſhip, is as ſenceleſs, and as great a contradiction to the Nature and End of Chriſtian Communion, as it would be to receive Heathens, Jews, Mahometans into the Chriſtian Church, by vertue of this *Negative Belief*. This I know he will not allow; for he ſays, *We are agreed in the other parts of our common Chriſtianity:* whereas it is abſolutely impoſſible, that we ſhould agree in any thing, which is *pure Chriſtianity*, while we differ in the Fundamental Doctrines of *the Trinity and Incarnation*, the owning or denying of which makes an eſſential Difference in Religion. It alters the Object of our Worſhip, as much as the Worſhip of One and of Three Perſons in the Godhead, and as much as the Worſhip of a God Incarnate, and of a deified *meer Man*, differ. It alters the way of our Salvation, as much as Faith in the Blood and Sacrifice of the Son of God, to expiate our Sins, differs from believing a great and excellent Prophet, and obeying his Laws. It alters the Motives and Principles of our Obedience, as much as the Love of God, in giving his Son, differs from his Goodneſs in ſending an excellent Man to be our Prophet and Saviour; as much as the Love, Humility, and Condeſcenſion of the Eternal Son of God, in becoming Man, and in dying as a Sacrifice for our Sins, differs from the Love of a

*See the Vindication of the Defence of Dr.* Stillingfleet's Unreaſonableneſs of Separation, *pag.* 256, &c.

meer Man, in preaching the Goſpel, and bearing Teſtimony to it by his own Blood.

It changes the hopes and reliances of Sinners, as much as the Security of a Meritorious Sacrifice offered by the Eternal Son of God for the Expiation of our Sins, differs from the Promiſes of an extraordinary Man ſent as a Prophet from God; and as much as the Interceſſion of a High Prieſt, who is the Eternal Son of God, and intercedes in the Merits of his own Blood, differs from the Interceſſion of a meer, though of an excellent Man, who has made no Atonement for our Sins, and has no other Intereſt in God, than what an innocent and obedient Man can pretend to. It were eaſie to enlarge on this Argument; but I have directed in the Margin, where the Reader may ſee it diſcourſed at large.

Now if this Author, for theſe Reaſons, will allow us to inſtruct our People in the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation, and not deſire us to receive Socinians into our Communion, he will do good Service, if he can bring them to his *Negative Belief*, and perſwade them to be ſilent; if he can't, we will try to make them ſo in time, if they have Wit enough to underſtand, when it is fit to be quiet.

*Page* 11. In the next place he takes Sanctuary *in the Act of Parliament in favour of Diſſenters*, which he *conceives has done very much, if not full enough.* But had he conſidered, how ſevere this Act is upon his *beloved Socinians*, he might much better have let it alone. For no *Diſſenters* have any benefit by that Act, who do not renounce *Socinianiſm*; But he pretends to give Account of Acts of Parliament, as he does of other Books, *without ſeeing them.* But we may ſee what a hearty good will he has to the Cauſe: if the Act has excepted *Socinians*,

*nians*, it is more than he knew, and more than he wiſhed; for he hoped it had not been done, and endeavoured to perſwade the World, that all the Biſhops of *England* had allowed it; for *he cannot believe, that the Body of the Biſhops diſallowed, or did not with good liking conſent to the Act*, viz. To give Liberty to *Socinians*, as he ſuppoſed. This is ſuch a ſcandalous Repreſentation of the Biſhops of *England*, as I'm ſure, they don't deſerve, and which in due time they may reſent.

And here, without any provocation, he ſets up the Authority of Biſhops, againſt the Lower Houſe of Convocation, who never differed upon this Point, and I hope never will, nor will ever be tempted by ſuch a forward Undertaker, to diſpute the Bounds of their Authority, but content themſelves with the Ancient Conſtitution of the Church of *England*. But if he underſtands *the Practice of the Primitive and truly Apoſtolick Church*, which he threatens theſe unruly Presbyters with, no better than he does K. *Edw.* VI.'s Reformation, which he ſuppoſes to be made by the Body of the Biſhops, in oppoſition to the Presbyters (or elſe I know not how he applies it) he is capable of doing no great good nor hurt. Only I can tell him one thing, That had he fallen into the hands of K. *Edw.*'s Reforming Biſhops, they would have reformed him out of the Church, or have taught him another ſort of *Compaſſionate Suit* than this.

He concludes with a heavy Charge upon Myſelf, and Dr. *Wallis*, (for he mentions none elſe) as *if we had receded from the Doctrine taught even in our own Church*, about the Holy Trinity. Page 13.

Do we then deny, that there are *Three Perſons* and *One God*? No, our buſineſs is to prove it, and explain and vindicate it? but he thinks we explain it otherwiſe,

wiſe, than it has been formerly explained. And yet that very Account he gives us of it, out of Mr. *Hooker*, is owned by myſelf, and particularly explained by my Hypotheſis. He has given us no juſt occaſion to vindicate ourſelves, becauſe he has not vouchſafed to tell us, why he diſlikes either of us. He has cited ſome broken paſſages out of my *Vindication*, about *Three Eternal Minds*, which are *eſſentially One Eternal Mind*. And what is the hurt of this? Is not every Divine Perſon who is God, a *Mind*, and an *Eternal Mind*? Is not the Λόγος, or the Eternal and Uncreated *Word* and *Wiſdom* of God, an *Eternal and Uncreated Mind*? Is not the ſubſtantial Word and Wiſdom of God a *Mind*? Is not the Eternal Spirit, *which ſearcheth the deep things of God, as the Spirit of a Man knoweth the things of a Man*, a Mind? And if I can give any poſſible account, how Three Eternal Minds ſhould be *eſſentially One*, does not this at leaſt prove, that there may be Three Divine Perſons, in the Unity of the Divine Eſſence? And ſhould I have been miſtaken in this account, as I believe I am not, muſt I therefore be charged with receding from the Doctrine of the Church of *England*? As for Dr. *Wallis*, he has nothing to ſay againſt him, but his calling the Divine Perſons *Somewhats*, with which he has very profanely ridiculed the Litany, which I gave an account before.

And now can any Man tell, what Opinion this *Melancholy Stander-by* has of the Doctrines of the Trinity, and Incarnation? He dares not ſpeak out, but gives very broad ſigns, what he would be at. He diſcourages all Men from defending theſe Doctrines, declares, That all *new Attempts* cannot *ſatisfie the old Difficulties*, which he declares to be *unſatisfiable, and unſoluble*: That *when we have moved every Stone, Authority muſt define it.* Page 7.

And

And yet this Authority extends no farther than to a *Negative Belief*. which, he ſays, is all that *can reaſonably be required of Men, of ſuch Myſteries as they cannot underſtand* : and thus far he *profeſſes himſelf bound by our Church Articles for Peace ſake.* And this is his Faith of the Trinity, not to believe it, but only not to oppoſe it. He complains of *the Scholaſtick cramping Terms* of *Three Perſons, and One God*, and thinks the *Unity of Three Perſons* in *One Eſſence*, to be only *a more Orthodox Phraſe* ; ſo that he leaves us no words to expreſs this Doctrine by, and therefore it is time to ſay nothing about it. It is *a Controverſie which expoſes our Liturgy, and is not only unprofitable, but corruptive of, and prejudicial and injurious to our common Devotion* : ſo dangerous is it to pray to the *Holy, Bleſſed, and Glorious Trinity, Three Perſons and One God.*

*Page 6.* *Page 2.* *Page 6.* *Page 17.*

But then on the other hand, he carefully practiſes that *forbearance*, which he perſwades others to, towards his *Learned Writers of the Socinian Controverſies*, tho' they were the Aſſailants: never perſwades them to forbear expoſing and ridiculing the Faith of the Church, which would have provoked his Indignation, had he any reverence for the Holy Trinity, and a God Incarnate ; but only thinks by the Charm of a *Negative Faith*, that *they may be required quietly to acquieſce in the publick determinations.*

*Page 9,10.*

He tells us over and over, how unſeaſonable and dangerous it is to meddle with ſuch high matters, or to offer at any Explication of what is *Incomprehenſible* ; but it is no fault in them, to talk of Abſurdities and Contradictions in what they do not underſtand : nay, he all along inſinuates, that theſe Abſurdities and Contradictions, which they charge upon the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, are *unſatisfiable*, and *un-*

He beſtows high Encomiums upon theſe Enemies of the Faith, but ſpeaks with wonderful Contempt of thoſe who defend it, as far as he dares; the Fathers and Councils are out of his reach, but the *Maſter of the Sentences*, and the *School-men*, and all Modern Undertakers, muſt feel his diſpleaſure: to defend the Trinity *expoſes our Liturgy*, and *corrupts* our *common Devotion*; but to ridicule it, makes them very *pious and devout Men*. GOD preſerve his Church from Wolves in Sheeps Clothing.

And now having vindicated our Ancient Rights and Liberties, which the Church always challenged, of defending the *truly Catholick and Apoſtolick Faith*, from the Aſſaults of Hereticks, I ſhall apply myſelf, as I have leiſure, to the Defence of my *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Holy and Ever-bleſſed Trinity*, and the *Incarnation of the Son of God*.

THE END.